

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/579,223	05/12/2006	Lorenzo De Ferra	622-94	622-94 7106	
23117 759 NIXON & VAND		EXAMINER			
901 NORTH GLE	EBE ROAD, 11TH FLOO	PUTTLITZ, KARL J			
ARLINGTON, V	A 22203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1621			
SHORTENED STATUTORY P	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONT	HS	02/21/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Annlics	ition No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/579			DE FERRA ET AL.			
		Examin		Art Unit				
		Karl J. I		1621	1			
	The MAILING DATE of this communic				dress			
Period fo								
WHIC - External after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MANSIONS OF THE MANSIONS OF THE MANSIONS OF THE MANSIONS OF THE MANSION OF THE MANSIO	ALING DATE OF 137 CFR 1.136(a). In no nication. utory period will apply and rill, by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUNICATION event, however, may a reply be style system of the sy	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this c NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed	I on 12 May 2006.						
2a) □								
7—	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 22-43 is/are pending in the	application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
·	)⊠ Claim(s) <u>22-43</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	<b>_</b> ::: <del></del>							
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ion and/or electior	requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
•	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:		b) objected to by th	e Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	the correction is req	uired if the drawing(s) is	objected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner.	Note the attached Offi	ce Action or form P	ΓΟ-152.			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. ☑ Copies of the certified copies of	•		ived in this National	Stage			
	application from the Internation	•						
* \$	See the attached detailed Office action	for a list of the ce	rtified copies not rece	ived.				
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summa		,			
2) Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P1	O-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa					
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/12/2006</u> .		6) Other:	arr atent Application	•			

Art Unit: 1621

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 22-31, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Those steps of forming the compound of formula 6 from the compound of formula 3 are critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See In re Mayhew, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). The rejected claims fail to recite those essential steps forr converting the compound of formula 3 to a compound of formula 6.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-39, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In clams 22, 40 and 41, the definition of "OTs" is unclear.

Claim 22 requires the preparation of compound 6 but prepares compounds of formula 3, so it is unclear what compound Applicant intends to prepare by the claim.

The claims recite "preferably", in connection, for example, with solvents (see claim 32), or tosyl compounds (claim 28). It is unclear what compounds or solvents Applicant intend to cover.

It is unclear what reactions Applicant intends by the term "the reaction" in claims 30 and 31.

Claim 32 recites removal of groups, subsequent reaction, and subsequent ion exchange. However, it is unclear if the claim requires these steps since the claim merely lists these steps and fails to positively recite these steps.

Claims 42 and 43 provides for the use of compounds but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Application/Control Number: 10/579,223

Art Unit: 1621

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27, 32-39, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,897,355 to Eppstein et al. (Eppstein).

The rejected claims cover, inter alai, preparation of the following compounds:

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
O & R_1 \\
O & R_1
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
O & R_1
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
P & R_2
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
R_4 & X^{\Theta}
\end{array}$$
(6)

Characterized that a compound of formula 2:

$$OR_5$$
 $OR_6$ 
 $OTs$  (2)

Is reacted with a tertiary amine to give a compound of the following formula:

Application/Control Number: 10/579,223

Art Unit: 1621

OR5

OR6

$$R_4 \Theta OTs$$
 $R_2 R_3$ 

(3)

With regard to the above embodiments, Eppstein teaches the following reaction at column 20:

Eppstein also teaches the subsequent steps of claims 32-37:

see also description in

columns 21 and 22.

[see definitions in column 3, for example]

it is apparent form the above formulas that the specific compounds covered by the claim are particularly taught by the reference, see claim 39.

The difference between the process disclosed by Eppstein and the process covered by the rejected claims is that Eppstein fails to explicitly teach incorporation of an ammonium group. However, Eppstein teaches, in the same column, a subsequent step of preparing the ammonium compound. Therefore, those of ordinary skill would have been motivated to modify the disclosure of Eppstein to include direct incorporation

Application/Control Number: 10/579,223 Page 6

Art Unit: 1621

of a tertiary amine, since the patent teaches that the ammonium compound is the final product. Moreover, the choice of solvents in synthetic chemistry, in the absence of some unexpected benefit is routine, since those of ordinary skill would select solvents, such as alcohols, based on solubility of the reagents, and products. In this regard, purification by crystallization is also routine. Accordingly, the rejected claims are prima facie obvious in view of Eppstein since the reference teaches or suggest the elements of these claims with a reasonable expectation of success.

Claims 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eppstein in view of Ren et al., Tetrahedron Letters 40 (1999) 209-212 (Ren).

The rejected claims cover those embodiments covering the preparation of starting compound:

$$OR_5$$
 $OR_6$ 
 $OT_8$ 
(2)

Application/Control Number: 10/579,223

Art Unit: 1621

Eppstein fails to teach this preparation of compound. However, it is for this proposition that the examiner joins Ren. Specification, Ren teaches preparation of the tosylate compound, see reactions c and d in scheme 4 on page 211:

Scheme 4. (a) R<sup>1</sup>COCI, TEA, cat DMAP, rt. 6h, 88%; (b) BCI<sub>3</sub>, -78 °C--28 °C, 30min, 74% (c) TSCI, Py, cat DMAP, rt. 6h, 65%; (d) R<sup>2</sup>COCI, TEA, cat DMAP, rt. 12hr, 80-87%; (e) LIBr, MEK, reflux, 1hr, 92%; (f) Me<sub>3</sub>N-DMSO, rt. 72h, pressure tube, 30-36%.

Those of ordinary skill would have been motivated to modify Eppstein to include the preparation of compound 2 since Ren teaches that this compound can be prepared as claimed. Therefore, the rejected claim are prima facie obvious in view of Eppstein and Ren since the combination of these references teach or suggest the elements of these claims with a reasonable expectation of success.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl J. Puttlitz whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Application/Control Number: 10/579,223 Page 8

Art Unit: 1621

0645. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page, can be reached at telephone number (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KARL PUTTLITZ PATENT EXAMINER